



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,204	01/03/2002	Melih Ogmen	00437-0007	7757

7590 02/16/2006

Orange & Chari  
Suite 4900  
66 Wellington Street West  
P.O. Box 190  
Toronto, ON M5K 1H6  
CANADA

EXAMINER
----------

JACKSON, JAKIEDA R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2655

DATE MAILED: 02/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/034,204

Applicant(s)

OGMEN, MELIH

Examiner

Jakieda R. Jackson

Art Unit

2655

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on March 29, 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. **Claims 1-6 and 8-10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ehsani et al. (PGPUB 2002/0128821), hereinafter referenced as Ehsani.

Regarding **claim 1**, Ehsani discloses a method of performing a task by a machine comprising the steps of:

providing information to said machine as a data structure indicative of meaning (column 4, paragraph 0065) and context (column 3, paragraph 0035) of said information in a natural language;

identifying data structures meeting criteria defined by said task (column 3, paragraph 0035); and

collecting said identified data structures (column 3, paragraph 0035).

Regarding **claim 2**, Ehsani discloses a method wherein said identified data structure are further processed on the basis of context indicated is said data structure (column 8, paragraph 0170).

Regarding **claim 3**, Ehsani wherein said data structure indicates relative importance of said information in said natural language (column 3, paragraph 0035).

Regarding **claim 4**, Ehsani discloses a method wherein said data structure includes an indication of role of said information in said natural language (column 8, paragraph 0169).

Regarding **claim 5**, Ehsani discloses a method wherein said data structure is applied to a word of a sentence in a natural language and said data structure indicates role and relative importance of said word within said sentence (column 4, paragraph 0080 with column 6, paragraph 0120).

Regarding **claim 6**, Ehsani discloses a method wherein said role and said importance of said word are indicated by co-ordinates in a matrix and retained in said data structure (column 9, paragraph 0179).

Regarding **claim 8**, Ehsani discloses an information retrieval system comprising a collection of information organized as data structures indicative of meaning (column 4, paragraph 0065) and context (column 3, paragraph 0035) of said information in a natural language, and interpretation engine to convert a query in a natural language in to a corresponding data structure and a search engine to identify common data structures in said query and said collection (column 5, paragraph 0083 with column 11, paragraph 0208 and columns 11-12, paragraph 0225).

Regarding **claim 9**, Ehsani discloses a system whereis said translation engine includes a translation device to allocate meaning to said query and a contextual function

Art Unit: 2655

to provide an indication of context within said structure (column 3, paragraph 0035 and column 4, paragraph 0065).

Regarding **claim 10**, Ehsani discloses a system including a function implementing a decision making algorithm to determine relative correspondence between said common data structures (grouped into classes; column 3, paragraph 0035 and column 8, paragraph 0166).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claim 7** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehsani in view of Bond et al. (USPN 6,539,348), hereinafter referenced as Bond.

Regarding **claim 7**, Ehsani discloses a method of performing a task by a machine, but does not specifically teach wherein said matrix includes an axis indicating tense of said word.

Bond discloses a method for parsing language sentences wherein it indicates the tense of a word (column 3, line 62 – column 4, line 14), to interpret whether an action happened or did happen when automatically processing the subject matter of a sentence.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ehsani's method wherein said matrix includes an axis indicating tense of said word, as taught by Bond, to provide great flexibility in terms of using data processing to analyze vast amounts of sentence inputs (column 3, line 62 – column 4, line 14).

5. **Claim 11** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehsani in view of Bates (PGPUN 2004/0205672), hereinafter referenced as Bates.

Regarding **claim 11**, Ehsani discloses an information retrieval system, but does not specifically teach a system wherein said function includes a fuzzy logic algorithm.

Bates discloses an automated system that includes a fuzzy logic algorithm (column 2, paragraph 0030, column 5, paragraph 0064 and column 6 paragraph 0076), to assist in finding variant spellings.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ehsani's system wherein said function includes a fuzzy logic algorithm, as taught by Bates, to determine possible variants and automatically add or remove hyphens, change capitalizations, modify spellings to "sound-alike" variants, etc (column 2, paragraph 0030, column 5, paragraph 0064 and column 6 paragraph 0076).

***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Cheyer et al. (USPN 6,859,931) disclose a software-based architecture for communication.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jakieda R. Jackson whose telephone number is 571.272.7619. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 5:00p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on 571.272.7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JRJ  
February 9, 2006

  
**DAVID HUDSPETH**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**